REMARKS

The Office Action mailed May 5, 2009 has been received and reviewed. Each of claims 1, 3-14 and 32 stands rejected. Claims 1, 3-14 and 32 have been cancelled herein rendering the current rejection regarding these claims moot. Claims 33-35 are new. Care has been exercised to introduce no new subject matter. Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3-14 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doleac (U.S. Patent No. 6,668,053, hereinafter Doleac) and further in view of Ash (U.S. Patent No. 5,559,877, hereinafter Ash). As noted above, claims 1, 3-14 and 32 have been cancelled herein rendering this rejection moot. Independent claim 33 should not be deemed unpatentable over Doleac in view of Ash because claim 33 contains elements taught by neither Doleac nor Ash. For example, neither Doleac nor Ash teaches "interfacing with a client application to receive a plurality of data and a service identification, wherein the plurality of data and the service identification both correspond to business logic that has no relationship to the computing device; accessing a database containing a list of available services." Furthermore, this element is fully supported by the Specification. (*See e.g.* Specification, p. 25, lines 2-17). Additionally, neither Doleac nor Ash teach "correlating the received service identification with an available service from the list of available services." (*See e.g.* Id.). Neither Doleac nor Ash teach "utilizing the available service correlation to generate a list of table names, wherein each table name corresponds to a table that must be populated to instruct the computing device to perform the task, wherein the task relates to a change of at least one telecommunication service

in a geographic area, wherein the change impacts a plurality of subscribers of the telecommunications network." (*See e.g.* Id.). Neither Doleac nor Ash teach "sending the list of table names to a command factory, wherein the command factory holds a list of pointers to one or more command builder components, receiving from the command factory, one or more pointers to one or more command builder components, wherein a pointer to a command builder component is received for each of the table names sent to the command factory, and wherein each command builder component generates one or more commands, wherein each generated command causes a record consisting of an ordered text string of fields to be created in an appropriate table when executed." (*See e.g.* Id., p. 25, lines 18-22 to p. 27, line 1). Neither Doleac nor Ash teaches "storing each command generated by each command builder component in a generated command list." (*See e.g.* Id., p. 26, line 20). Neither Doleac nor Ash teaches "receiving an indication from the client application that every command in the generated command list should be executed." (*See e.g.* Id., p. 26, lines 21-22). Finally, neither Doleac nor Ash teach "instructing each command builder component for which a pointer was received to execute its corresponding one or more generated commands, wherein upon execution of the one or more generated commands, the computing device is able to perform the task." (*See e.g.* Id., p. 27, lines 8-11).

Dependent claim 34 should not be deemed unpatentable over Doleac in view of Ash at least because of the arguments made above with respect to claim 33 (from which claim 34 depends) and because neither Doleac nor Ash teach "wherein the computing device is a switch and wherein the plurality of data received from the client application relates to call routing criteria for a Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) of interest." (*See e.g.* Id., p. 21, lines 11-14).

Similarly, dependent claim 35 should not be deemed unpatentable over Doleac in view of Ash at least because of the arguments made above with respect to claim 34 (from which claim 35 depends) and because neither Doleac nor Ash teach "wherein the plurality of data received from the client application includes one or more of dialing patterns, trunk groups, terminating end offices, and files used to differentiate between local and long distance calls." (*See e.g.* Id., p. 21, lines 11-14).

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 33-35 are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the pending rejections and allowance of the claims. If any issues remain that would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned – 816-474-6550 or cpendergrass@shb.com (such communication via email is herein expressly granted) – to resolve the same. It is believed that no fee is due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any amount required to Deposit Account No. 21-0765.

Respectfully submitted,

/Callie A. Pendergrass/

Callie A. Pendergrass
Reg. No. 63,949

CAPS/tq
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Blvd.
Kansas City, MO   64108-2613
816-474-6550